APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/078,605	02/19/2002	Michael John Branson	ROC920010345US1	5551

		EXAMINER
7590	09/21/2005 .	BHATIA, AJAY M

Gero G. McClellan
Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, L.L.P.
Suite 1500
3040 Post Oak Boulevard
Houston, TX 77056-6582

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/078,605	BRANSON ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Ajay M. Bhatia	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _06 July 2005_.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1,2 and 4-30_ is/are pending in the application.
     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1,2 and 4-30_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
     a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
       1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
       2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
       3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,2 and 4-30 have been considered

but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant's amendment

necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter. Rejected claim(s) do not clearly define the

claimed invention as a tangible embodiment therefore claim(s) are non-statutory. MPEP

§ 2105, states that an article of manufacture must be made from raw materials.

Applicant may include the limitation "contained on a tangible embodied computer

readable medium" to over come this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Matson et al. (U.S. Patent 6,668,254) in view of Landry (U.S. Patent 5,649,117).

For claim 1, Matson et al. teaches, a method if maintaining a database for

managing a process of a plurality of transactions through two or more application in a

business transaction environment, each application having at least one associated log

file, and (see Matson et al. , Col. 2 lines 61-67, Col. 3 lines 9-16)

accessing each of the respective associated log files, wherein at least two

of the associated log files are of different formats; (see Matson et al. , abstract, Col. 3

lines 9-16)

for each new log files are of different formats; (see Matson et al. , abstract,

Col. 3 lines 9-16)

for each new log entry recorded in the respective associated log file being

accessed:

(i) determining whether the new log entry comprises one of more required

fields using mapping rules that describe a location and format of at least the one or

more required fields in the respective associated log file: (see Matson et al. , Col. 3 lines

9-16, Col. 4 lines 16-21, Col. 5 lines 16-21, Col. 5 lines 22-38, new log entries are

mapped in to fields in the XML file)

(ii) extracting information from the new log entry only if the new log entry

comprises the one of more required fields; (see Matson et al. , Col. 6 lines 14-16)

and (iii) storing the information as a plurality of transaction records to a

database. (see Matson et al. , Col. 9 lines 47-60)

Matson et al. fails to clearly disclose, each transaction being defined by one or more

steps configured to complete the transaction, the method comprising:

Landry teaches, each transaction being defined by one or more steps configured to

complete the transaction, the method comprising: (see Landry, figure 2A&B)

It would have been obvious to on of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to combine Matson et al.'s system of processing new data into a

data into a database with Landry's method of defining records as transactions, since it is

well known in the art that a database is designed to hold any type of record, and it

would be obvious to make use of the database to support as may types of records, in

order to increase the profitability of the database application by having an increased

user base (more users are able to buy and use the product). (see Matson et al. , Col. 2

Col. 61-67, Matson et al. provides for uses other then on-line shopping)

For claim 2, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 1, further comprising

receiving a notification message from the respective associated log file indicating that

the new log entry has been recorded in the respective associated log file. (see Matson

et al. , Col. 4 lines 35-53, by doing a diff, the system is able to differentiate if a new log

entry is filed)

For claim 4, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein the

information is extracted from the new log entry using the mapping rules providing the

format and the location of the information in the new log entry. (see Matson et al. , Col.

5 lines 16-21, Col. 5 lines 22-38, new log entries are mapped in to fields in the XML file)

For claim 5, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 1, further comprising

determining whether the plurality of transaction records meets an undesirable condition;

(see Matson et al., Col. 6 lines 24-28, undesired condition is that record is missing

information)

and executing an action responsive to the undesirable condition if the plurality of

transactions meets the condition. (see Matson et al. , Col. 6 lines 24-28, records are

moved the fault data file, this is the action to the undesirable condition)

For claim 6, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 5, wherein the condition

is whether a number of the plurality of transaction records indicative of active

transactions exceeds a predefined numerical limit. (see Matson et al. , Col. 8 lines 1-19,

it would be obvious to make the response to the condition to trust the results)

For claim 7, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 5, wherein the condition

is whether any of the plurality of transaction records indicative of active transactions has

a time duration exceeding a predefined time limit. (see Landry, Col. 7 lines 20-29) The

same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to

claim 7.

For claim 8, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 5, wherein executing the

action comprises sending a notification message alerting the condition. (see Landry,

Col. 31 lines 36-53) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1,

applies equally as well to claim 8.

For claim 9, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 5, wherein the action

comprises executing a computer program for resolving the condition. (see Landry, Col.

30 lines 7-21) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies

equally as well to claim 9.

For claim 10, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein the one or

more required fields comprises at least one of a transaction identifier, a step identifier,

and a time stamp. (see Matson et al. , Col. 6 lines 24-29) and (see Landry, figure

2A&B, Col. 13 lines 35-60) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of

claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 10.

For claim 11, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 10, wherein step

identifier is a unique identifier associated with a step of the transaction. (see Landry,

Col. 13 lines 35-60, Col. 34 lines 14-44) The same motivation that was utilized in the

rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 11.

For claim 12, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 10, wherein the time

stamp indicates a time at which the step started. (see Landry, Col. 30 lines 8-21) The

same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to

claim 12.

For claim 13, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein the

information comprises at least one of a transaction type, a transaction origin, and a

transaction destination, the transaction type, the transaction origin and the transaction

destination identifying the transaction record. (see Landry, figure 2A&B) The same

motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim

13.

For claim 14, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 13, wherein the

transaction type describes the type of transaction. (see Landry, figure 2A&B) The same

motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim

14.

For claim 15, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 13, wherein the

transaction origin describes an entity that originated the transaction. (see Landry, figure

2A&B) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally

as well to claim 15.

For claim 16, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 13, wherein the

transaction destination describes a final destination of the transaction. (see Landry,

figure 2A&B) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies

equally as well to claim 16.

For claim 17, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein storing the

information comprises storing the information to the database as one of a transaction

record and a step record, the transaction record being defined by one or more step

records. (see Landry, figure 2A&B) The same motivation that was utilized in the

rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 17.

For claim 18, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 17, wherein the

information comprises at least one of a step type and a step location, the step type and

the step location identifying the step record. (see Landry, figure 2A&B) The same

motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim

18.

For claim 19, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 18, wherein the step type describes the operation performed by one of the two or more applications at the time the new log entry is recorded. (see Landry, figure 2A&B ,Col. 34 lines 14-44) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 19.

For claim 20, Matson et al.-Landry teaches, the method of claim 18, wherein the step location describes a computer of at least one of the two or more applications. (see Landry, figure 2A&B, Col. 34 lines 14-44) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 20.

Claims 21-30 list all the same elements of claims 1-2, 3-20, but in computer readable medium and system form rather than method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claims 1-2, 3-20 applies equally as well to claims 21-30.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached UPSTO 892 (if appropriate).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ajay M. Bhatia whose telephone number is (571)-272-3906. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571)272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AB

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER